DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 649 TM 021 063

TITLE	Review of Literature and Survey Results for the Utah State Core Curriculum Performance Assessment. [Draft.]
INSTITUTION	Profiles Corp.
SPONS AGENCY	Utah State Office of Education, Salt Lake City.
PUB DATE	Aug 92
NOTE	31p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Criteria; Critical Thinking; Curriculum Development; *Educational Assessment; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Literature Reviews; Problem Solving; Standards; *State Departments of Education; State Programs; Surveys; Tables (Data); *Test Construction; Test Use
IDENTIFIERS	*Performance Based Evaluation; *Utah

ABSTRACT

In 1992 the Utah State Office of Education initiated a review of recent literature on performance assessment as a step in establishing the foundation of the Utah State Core Curriculum Performance Assessment Program. Profiles Corporation conducted the review of the literature and contacted educators in all 50 states regarding the current state of large-scale performance assessment. This summary of the nature, design, and use of performance assessments is based on the review and survey. Performance assessment is a response to the calls for educational change that are sweeping the country, and it reflects society's need to produce creative problem solvers, critical thinkers, and information processors. The literature review and the survey make it clear that performance assessments are being developed by states and districts across the country. In general, states are taking their time in developing and testing the new assessments because they are mindful of the problems involved in performance assessment and are attaching high stakes to its results. Implications of the review and survey for the state core-curriculum program are discussed. Survey results are summarized in an attachment, and there is a nine-page table of findings. (Contains 34 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 649

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. RAPHAEL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND SURVEY RESULTS

For the
Utah State Core Curriculum
Performance Assessment

Prepared by

PROFILES CORPORATION

TM 021063

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Review of Literature 1

Bibliography 9

Summary of Survey Results 12

Table of Survey Results 13

Articles on Performance Assessment 21

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

In 1992, the Utah State Office of Education initiated a review of recent literature on performance assessment for the purpose of establishing a solid foundation on which to build the Utah State Core Curriculum Performance Assessment Program. Profiles Corporation conducted the review of the literature and contacted educators in all fifty states regarding the current state of large-scale performance assessment. This summary of the nature, design, and use of performance assessments examines the following topics:

- A brief historical background of assessment in the United States
- How performance assessment responds to the changing educational needs of today's students
- The impact performance assessments can have on educational practices as they model new methods of instruction
- How performance assessment places evaluation in the hands of teachers and students
- The ramifications of performance assessment's criterion-referenced orientation
- How performance assessment takes the secrecy out of testing
- Prominent psychometric issues related to performance assessment
- Preliminary conclusions of the literature review and the Profiles survey
- Initial implications of the review and the Profiles study for the Utah State Performance Assessment

Historical background

Performance assessment is a response to broad, fundamental changes that are sweeping over both education and the larger society. Earlier in this century, when the United States was an industrial-based society, it seemed logical for educators to spread the country's school children across an achievement continuum. Traditional assessment's goal was to attain the greatest possible refinement in selecting the cream of the crop for higher education. The vast majority of students, represented by the great bulge in the middle of psychometricians' bell-shaped curve and the tail below it, were tracked for jobs in factories and other kinds of manual labor (Hill, 1992; Stiggins, 1991). Such assessment honored the notion that there was a step on society's ladder for everyone, and that norm-referenced tests would help identify the step where each person should probably sit. As our economy has shifted to an information/services base implemented by high technology, the achievement levels required by most jobs have risen dramatically and are fundamentally different in kind than previous levels. Those students represented in the bottom half of the curve find that

there is no longer necessarily a niche for them. Many of the lower steps have been removed from society's ladder. These students have become a population at risk. Some researchers have gone so far as to say that our educational system and the accompanying assessment scheme that relegated students to their position in society have become obsolete (Stiggins, 1991).

As the United States faces the new challenges of the next century, the issue of accountability in education has become paramount in the eyes of many of the nation's decision makers. Congress, professional organizations, and the National Council on Educational Standards and Testing want to hold districts, teachers, and students accountable for their educational outcomes. Their purpose is to ensure the quality of education in our country and to see that equal opportunities are available to all school children. They believe this can be accomplished by:

1) setting clear, high standards that define what students should know and how well they should know it;
2) setting criteria for what schools must provide so that students can actually reach those standards;
3) assessing all students rather than just a sample;
4) making assessments more effective by resorting increasingly to performance-based measures (Wolf et al, 1992).

The emphasis has shifted from ranking children on the basis of their basic skills to improving both schools' and students' performances. In an educational environment that has been assessed almost exclusively by norm-referenced tests, performance assessment can bring balance to a lopsided picture by evaluating broad outcomes in addition to discrete skills, quality of learning as well as breadth of learning, process as well as product, and divergent thinking as well as conformity (Finch & Dost, 1992).

Responding to the educational needs of today's students

Performance assessment reflects our need to produce a society of creative problem-solvers, critical thinkers, and information processors, as opposed to memorizers of isolated facts. While basic skills are, by definition, fundamental, they can do no more than provide a foundation for the development of more important skills. The nation's students must be able to apply basic skills in new and complex situations. Performance assessment takes testing beyond the "right answer" mentality and the most elementary levels of thinking. It evaluates students' ability to organize and utilize their knowledge "tool kits" to produce desired outcomes. It accomplishes this by requiring them to: 1) bring a number of skills to bear on complex, multi-step problems; 2) structure the problems; 3) integrate many separate pieces of knowledge and several thinking processes in one task; 4) find multiple paths and solutions; and, finally, 5) reflect on and evaluate their own performance (Stiggins, 1991; Wiggins, 1992; Finch & Dost, 1992).

Promoting educational reform

Performance assessment should provide appropriate models for educational reform. In fact, some educators have suggested that it should derive its evidence for validity primarily from its success in advancing educational reform (Hill, 1992). Rather than existing out of context with instruction, it has the potential to positively impact modes of teaching and learning by becoming an integral part of instruction itself (Finch, 1992; Hill, 1992; O'Neil, 1992). Tasks should be embedded in authentic contexts relevant to both the wider world and day-to-day instructional settings. These settings should also be meaningful, engaging, and essential to the student. There is considerable evidence showing that performance assessment is positively influencing instructional practices and student performance in states and districts where it is being used (Herman, 1992; Profiles 1992 survey).

Assessment in the hands of teachers and students

Assessment has traditionally been the realm of specialists in measurement and statistics. Performance assessment puts evaluation squarely in the hands of teachers. Research has shown that teachers are capable and reliable assessors of performance units; interrater reliabilities of .90 have often been achieved (Easton, 1991; Dunbar et al, 1992). This experience, in turn, enhances teachers' skills as evaluators in day-to-day classroom assessments, where 99% of all assessment takes place. Teachers and administrators are in a better position to shape the assessment process because performance assessments can respond readily to their achievement targets (Stiggins, 1991). Students are also drawn into the assessment process, particularly if they collect their work in portfolios and have the opportunity to help select which pieces are to remain in the portfolios each year (Wiggins, 1992; Wolf et al, 1992). In addition, performance units can and should require students to assess their own work by reflecting on the strengths and weaknesses of their problem-solving experiences.

Criterion-referenced approach to testing

Performance assessment's criterion-referenced orientation aims to reduce variability between the best and worst performances by students rather than to produce fine distinctions between them. It also demands high standards of performance for *all* students by modeling quality exit-level products. For example, Illinois has assessed 6th grade writing tasks by using outstanding 8th grade examples as the scoring standard (Wiggins, 1992). These standards should not be arbitrary cut scores but should reflect benchmarks rooted in the real world. Performance assessment places an emphasis on outcomes by steering away from relative comparisons of students' work and focusing on what students can actually do. The curve disappears; it is simply not relevant in a criterion-referenced context.

Secrecy in testing disappears

The mystery and secrecy that surrounds traditional testing is not appropriate in performance assessment. Tasks and standards should be known to teachers and students in advance (Wiggins, 1992; Diez & Moon, 1992). Teachers use these scoring criteria to design classroom experiences that will prepare students for the assessment. Tasks are practiced in the classroom during daily lessons, much as a piano piece is practiced in preparation for a recital performance. The goal is to produce high quality outcomes, and this can come about only by returning again and again to the task and refining and reevaluating one's efforts.

Some psychometric issues in performance assessment

Designers and users of performance assessments and traditional assessment specialists have grappled with the issues of evidence for their validity and reliability. Most agree that the old models of validity and reliability are not adequate to evaluate performance assessments (Linn et al, 1991; Hill, 1992). But what needs to be expanded and what needs to be kept intact? Broad, representative sampling of the curriculum seems to be important to the extent that the performance assessment does not serve to narrow instructional focus and thus sabotage its own efforts at educational reform (Herman, 1992). While a narrower focus may result in a more reliable test in the traditional sense, it reduces the evidence for content validity (Dunbar et al, 1992). Some psychometricians caution that inadequate sampling of the content domain also reduces the assessments' ability to give accurate estimates of individual performance levels. Shavelson and colleagues (1991; 1992) suggest that perhaps eight to twenty tasks covering ten different topic areas may be needed for a single subject area. Given the costs of scoring performance units, this could best be accomplished by having students add different units to their portfolios over the course of several years. Portfolios would also emphasize habitual outcomes to students and their parents. Most importantly, they would chart growth in both groups and individuals (Wiggins, 1992; Wolf et al, 1992). On the other hand, Hill (1992) and others contend that traditional models of reliability and validity should have a minor role in performance assessment. In the context of performance tasks, reliability becomes an important issue only if a lack of it negatively affects future instruction. In a related mode, evidence for consequential validity, not content validity, is of primary importance in evaluating performance assessments. In other words, does the assessment help to accomplish the desired educational reform?

Since students typically perform at somewhat different achievement levels from one task to another in a given subject area, it is not advisable to report student achievement by a single evaluation for each subject area. This variation in a student's scores within a single content area is not a troublesome phenomenon, however. On the contrary, it most likely reflects desirable variation in teaching and evaluation methods (Dunbar et al, 1991). Similarly, subscores within a

single content area are regularly reported in traditional standardized tests because of this variation. However, an important distinction should be made between the two kinds of tests. In traditional tests the subscores represent a breakdown of skill areas, but in performance assessments it is tasks, not skills, that are reflected in the subscores, since a range of skills are required to accomplish any single task.

Evaluation criteria

Scoring is more costly and difficult for the performance assessment than for the standardized multiple choice test. However, scoring criteria should not be determined by cost or ease of scoring. Rather, it is essential to create scoring criteria that reflect what really matters in the performance of a task (O'Neil, 1992). In doing so, the integrity of the student's task is maintained. Carefully constructed scoring criteria coupled with adequate training for raters will lead to accurate scoring and high interrater consistency. In this context, the use of scoring criteria is not a subjective process, albeit a more complicated one than machine scoring a multiple-choice test. Wiggins (1992) suggests that two key questions be asked when creating a scoring system: 1) "What are the most salient characteristics of each level or quality of response?" and "What are the errors that are most justifiable for use in lowering a score?" He cautions that scoring criteria should make use of descriptive language rather than evaluative language such as "good," "excellent," and "fair." Quellmalz (1991) describes desirable characteristics of scoring criteria, such as their generalizability to similar tasks, how well they fit the task and the target population, whether they communicate clearly to all audiences — students, teachers, parents, community — so that they can be understood and applied, and whether they help to guide decision-making about educational reform.

Baker et al (1991) suggest these criteria for the evaluation of the performance exercises themselves: consequences, fairness, transfer and generalizability, cognitive complexity, content quality, content coverage, meaningfulness, cost and efficiency. Linguistic load is becoming a pressing issue in the evaluation of performance assessments, as well.

The literature and the Profiles survey

The Profiles survey was sent to educators in all 50 states, requesting information about their large-scale performance assessment programs. It is apparent from the sample of materials received by Profiles Corporation that the performance assessments being developed by states and districts across the country are, for the most part, striving to reach the ideals set forth in the literature. Many exercises are embedded in authentic contexts, combining a number of processes, encouraging critical thinking, and requiring creative performances of the students being evaluated. Selected samples also make clear, however, that it is

possible for performance assessments to duplicate the weaknesses of standardized multiple-choice tests. A constructed-response format does not automatically raise the level of thinking required to answer a question. Many "performance assessment" exercises are simply measuring low-level recall that could be more efficiently measured in a multiple-choice format. A task that takes longer to do and to score than a multiple-choice question is not automatically more meaningful, relevant, authentic, or even a true performance. A performance assessment impacts instruction and learning positively only to the extent that it has been carefully and thoughtfully constructed in response to the achievement goals of the state or school district.

The results of the survey revealed that most states are taking their time to develop and field test the new assessments before attaching high stakes to individual and group scores. It is imperative for the success of a program of performance assessment that teaching and learning be given a reasonable opportunity to change in response to the new models of instruction. Typically, students perform poorly when a performance assessment program is first implemented. When standards are high (as they should be) and students are generally unpracticed in creatively utilizing a range of skills and thinking processes to perform a complex task, scores will initially be low. Instruction and learning does respond to this modeling, however, and scores should improve without having to sacrifice the standards of quality. This sort of reform is precisely what performance assessment aims to bring about. If high stakes are attached to students' scores too early in the program's implementation, then future teaching and learning will be compromised (O'Neil, 1992).

Performance assessment is not a panacea for the persistent problem of group differences that has plagued standardized multiple-choice tests since their inception, nor is it an easy answer to the problem of achieving equity in evaluation. There is no clear evidence as yet that differences among gender and ethnic groups are greater or lesser for performance measures than for traditional measures (Herman, 1992; Dunbar et al, 1992). However, performance assessment's potential to bring about positive changes in schools across gender and ethnic lines makes this issue one to watch closely in the next few years.

Finally, it appears that performance assessment can be a powerful, liberating force guiding educational reform, or it can become merely another burden for already burdened teachers. If performance assessment is to positively influence teaching and learning, teachers must be informed and involved in all stages of the program's development. Materials must be usable and "teacher friendly." O'Neil (1992) appropriately demanded that scoring criteria reflect the true nature of the task. However, if scoring is consistently too difficult or too expensive, then educators will eventually begin to look elsewhere for answers to their assessment needs, and perhaps even return to traditional testing formats. If this occurs, then the long-needed, long-awaited reforms may well die before they have a chance to become rooted in the educational system.

Initial implications of the literature review and the Profiles survey for the Utah State Core Curriculum Performance Assessment

The design of Utah's State Performance Assessment should capitalize on the best of current theory and the strengths of assessments already in existence. It should also avoid the pitfalls and weaknesses exhibited by some assessments in use. The following ten general guidelines will be used in the development of the performance assessments:

1) The performance assessments will, first and foremost, arise from and be guided by Utah's Core Curriculum. The tasks will be a representative sample of the content areas and concepts dictated for each subject area and grade by the curriculum's standards and objectives. In addition, each task will require a number of processes in its execution. The processes will sample from key activities identified in the standards and objectives (for example, a science unit might incorporate such processes as "observe," "classify," "compare," and "infer"). The scoring criteria will also reflect the standards and objectives of the Core Curriculum.
2) Tasks will be time-effective for students and teachers. Each assessment will be approximately four pages in length and will be designed to be performed in 45 minutes to an hour. The scoring criteria will be clear and easy to understand and use.
3) Materials and packaging will be designed so that teachers can easily duplicate assessments for student use. Assessments will be printed one-sided with each sheet coded to simplify organization and duplication.
4) Schools will not be required to have special manipulatives or manipulative "kits" in order to participate in the assessment process. Assessment materials will be limited to objects normally found in any typical classroom.
5) Tasks will require students to think critically and to solve relevant problems.
6) Assessments will be embedded in contexts that are meaningful and engaging to the students, as well as reflective of real world tasks.
7) Materials will be sensitive to ethnic and gender differences.
8) Standards for evaluation of the assessments will be high and demand excellent performances from students. They will reflect realistic rather than arbitrary benchmarks.
9) Assessments will be constructed so that they model instruction that enhances student learning. Students will be required to structure problems and then integrate knowledge and processes to solve them. Many tasks will have multiple paths and solutions to encourage divergent thinking. Whenever appropriate, self-evaluation will be an integral part of each assessment.
10) The evaluation criteria will be taken into account in the design and administration of the field test.

Profiles Corporation is continuing to communicate with the states and school districts that are conducting large-scale performance assessments. These assessments are evolving rapidly, and an ongoing exchange of ideas is essential to their overall success in the United States. The door is open for potentially powerful, positive educational reform, and performance assessment is a key component in this movement. The Utah State Core Curriculum Performance Assessment Program can be a boon to students and educators in Utah. In addition, by participating in the forefront of this reform, it may help to move the entire country's educational system forward to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

General

Aschbacher, Pamela R. (1991). Performance assessment: state activity, interest, and concerns. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 4(4), 275-288.

Baker, Eva L., and Joan L. Herman (1983). Task structure design: beyond linkage. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 20(2), 149-163.

Baron, Joan Boykoff (1990). Performance assessment: blurring the edges among assessment, curriculum, and instruction. In Champagne, Lovitts, and Calinger (Eds.), *This Year In School Science 1990* (pp.127-147), Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Baron, Joan Boykoff (1991). Strategies for the development of effective performance exercises. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 4(4), 305-318.

Coffman, William E. (1966). On the validity of essay tests of achievement. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 3(2), 151-156.

Diez, Mary E., and C. Jean Moon (1992). What do we want students to know: . . . and other important questions. *Educational Leadership*, v.49, 38-41.

Dunbar, Stephen B., Daniel M. Koretz, and H. D. Hoover (1992). Quality control in the development and use of performance assessments. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 4(4), 289-303.

Easton, Lois Brown (1991). Developing educational performance tests for a statewide program. In Frederick L. Finch (Ed.), *Educational performance assessment* (pp. 47-62). Chicago: The Riverside Publishing Company.

Finch, Fredrick L. (1991). Issues in educational performance evaluation. In Fredrick L. Finch (Ed.), *Educational performance assessment* (pp. 1-18). Chicago: The Riverside Publishing Company.

Finch, Fredrick L., and Marcia A. Dost (1992). Toward an operational definition of educational performance assessments. Presented at the ECS/CDE Assessment Conference, Boulder, Colorado, June 4, 1992.

Frederiksen, John R., and Allan Collins (1989). A systems approach to educational testing. *Educational Researcher*, 18(9), 27-32.

Glaser, Robert (1984). Education and thinking - the role of knowledge. *American Psychologist*, 39(2), 93-104.

Greeno, James G. (1989). A perspective on thinking. *American Psychologist*, 44(2), 141-143.

Haertel, Edward. Performance measurement. In M.C. Alkin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (6th ed.).

Herman, Joan L. (1992). What research tells us about good assessment. *Educational Leadership*, v.49, 74-78.

Hill, Richard (1992). Assessments developed in support of educational reform in contrast to assessments developed in support of educational refinement. Presented at 1992 ECS/CDE Assessment Conference, June 4, 1992.

Linn, Robert L., Eva L. Baker, and Stephen B. Dunbar (1991). Complex, performance-based assessment: expectations and validation criteria. *Educational Researcher*, 20(8), 15-21.

Miller-Jones, Dalton (1989). Culture and testing. *American Psychologist*, 44(2), 360-366.

O'Neil, John (1992). Putting performance assessment to the test. *Educational Leadership*, v.49, 14-19.

Osterlind, Steven J. (1991). Scoring procedures for performance tests. In Fredrick L. Finch (Ed.), *Educational performance assessment* (pp. 63-79). Chicago: The Riverside Publishing Company.

Quellmalz, Edys S. (1991). Developing criteria for performance assessments: the missing link. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 4(4), 319-331.

Rothman, Robert (1992). Vt. forced to delay goal of expanding assessment system. *Education Week*, May 20, 1992.

Stiggins, Richard J. (1991). Facing the challenges of a new era of educational assessment. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 4(4), 263-273.

Wiggins, Grant, and C. W. Peters (1989). A true test: toward more authentic and equitable assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70, 703-713.

Wiggins, Grant (1992). Creating tests worth taking. *Educational Leadership*, v.49, 26-33.

Wolf, Dennie Palmer, Paul G. LeMahieu, and JoAnne Eresh (1992). Good measure: assessment as a tool for educational reform *Educational Leadership*, v.49, 8-13.

Science

Shavelson, Richard J., Gail P. Baxter, and Jerome Pine (1991). Performance assessment in science. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 4(4), 263-273.

Shavelson, Richard J., and Gail P. Baxter (1992). What we've learned about assessing hands-on science. *Educational Leadership*, v. 49, 20-25.

Mathematics

Mullis, Ina V. S. (1992). Developing the NAEP content-area frameworks and innovative assessment methods in the 1992 assessments of mathematics, reading, and writing. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 29(2), 111-131.

Pandey, Tej (1990). Power items and the alignment of curriculum and assessment. In G. Kulm (Ed.), *Assessing higher order thinking in mathematics* (pp. 39-51). Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Szetela, Walter, and Cynthia Nicol (1992). Evaluating problem solving in mathematics. *Educational Leadership*, v. 49, 42-45.

Social Studies

Baker, Eva L., Marie Freeman, and Serena Clayton (1991). Cognitive assessment of history for large-scale testing. In M. C. Wittrock and E. L. Baker (Eds.), *Testing and cognition* (pp. 131-153). New York: Prentice Hall.

Court, Deborah (1991). Teaching critical thinking: what do we know? *The Social Studies*, 82(3), 115-119.

Fazio, Beverly (1992). Students as historians — writing their school's history. *The Social Studies*, 83(2), 64-67.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

Profiles Corporation contacted the State Departments of Education in the fifty states, including State Superintendents and Directors of Education, Academic Testing Supervisors, and Research Personnel. Administrators in the country's largest school districts were also contacted.

Information was collected from all fifty states. The chart on the following pages summarizes the data from the surveys. Forty states reported having state-wide performance assessment programs either in place or in development. Two other states indicated that performance assessment plans would be made sometime in the next five years. Eight states reported no definite plans for a performance assessment program.

The current programs range from a single subject area being tested on one grade level to six or more subject areas on several grade levels. By far the most common state performance assessment being conducted is a direct writing assessment (31 states). Reading, math, language arts, science, social studies, physical education, and art were also listed as subject areas currently being evaluated.

In addition to returning the surveys, many states sent descriptive materials. These included summaries of their programs, samples of performance tasks for various grade levels in different subject areas, scoring criteria for the tasks, reports of student progress, and public information publications describing the programs.

It is significant to note that 84% of the respondents who reported having programs in place or in development sent accompanying materials and/or expressed an interest in discussing their programs in greater detail. This willingness to share information is one indicator that performance assessment has widespread support and interest in the educational community.

SURVEY OF STATES

State	Conducting a Performance Assessment Program?	Status of Program	Subjects, grades assessed	Contact Person
Alabama	Yes	in place	Reading – Gr. 2 Writing – Gr. 2, 5, 7 Math – Gr. 7–12	Gloria Turner, Coordinator, Student Assessment Section Dorothy DeMars, Education Specialist, Assessment Section
Alaska	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr 5, 7, 9, 10, 11 Various district programs	Lesley Scharrer, Education Specialist
Arizona	Yes	in place developing	Writing – Gr. 1–12 Math – Gr. 1–12 Reading – Gr. 1–12 Science & Social St. – Gr. 1–12	Barbara Nordlund, Director, Arizona Student Assessment Program
Arkansas	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 5, 9, 11	Marlene Parker, Public School Advisor
California	Yes	in place	English, Language Arts – Gr. 4, 8, 10 Math – Gr. 4, 8, 10 Science, History, Social St. – Gr. 5, 8, 10	Bob Anderson – CAP staff Doreen Burda – CAP staff
• Fresno	Yes	in place		Heidi Estep, Director Educational Assessment Services
• Los Angeles	No	—	—	Dale McIntire, Coordinator, Division of Adult and Occupational Education Services
• Oakland	No	—	—	Alma Williams, Testing Coordinator
• Sacramento	No	—	—	Morris Mueller, Research Specialist – SCUSD
• San Diego	Yes	developing	Math – Gr. 4, 8, 10 Language Arts – Gr. 4, 8, 10 Writing – Gr. 8, 12 Science – Gr. 6 Social St. – Gr. 6, 12	Linda Carstens, Evaluation Special Assignment

State	Conducting a Performance Assessment Program?	Status of Program	Subject areas, grades assessed	Contact Person
Colorado	Yes	in place developing	Writing – Gr. 4, 7, 10 other areas	Don Watson, Senior Consultant for Student Assessment
• Jefferson Co.	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 3, 5, 7, 9, 12	Dr. Diane Proctor, Coordinator, Assessment/Accountability
Connecticut	Yes	in place and developing	Math – Gr. 4, 6, 8, 10 Reading – Gr. 4, 6, 8 Writing – Gr. 4, 6, 8 Science – Gr. 4, 6, 8	John B. Rogers, Education Service Assistant Douglas Rindone, Acting Director, Division of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Delaware	Yes	in place developing	Writing Math, Science, English/Language Arts, Social St.	Chester Freed, Director of Planning and Assessment Dr. Kaye McCann, Supervisor, Dept. of Public Instruction
Florida	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 4, 8, 10	Thomas Fisher, Administrator, Student Services
• Polk Co.	Yes	in place	—	Brenda Koon, Director of Comprehensive Planning and Assessment
• Volusia Co.	No	—	—	Jack McCabe, Student Assessment Specialist
• Broward Co.	No	—	—	Gene Barlow, Director, Evaluation and Testing
• Palm Beach Co.	Yes	in place	—	Marc Baron, Director, Dept. of Research and Evaluation
• Duval Co.	Yes	developing	—	Howard D. Winesett, General Director, Instructional Research
• Pinellas Co.	No	—	—	Dr. Alex Epanchin, Director of Testing
• Hillsborough Co.	No	—	—	Michele Watts, Data Analyst
• Brevard Co.	No	—	—	James H. Hulse, Director of Testing

State	Conducting a Performance Assessment Program?	Status of Program	Subject areas, grades assessed	Contact Person
Georgia	Yes	developing in place	Writing – Gr. 3, 5, 11 Writing – Gr. 8, 10 Kindergarten evaluation	Kathleen Gooding, Consultant, Georgia Dept. of Education
• Atlanta	Yes	in place	Kindergarten evaluation	Margaret Brooks, Director of Testing, Dept. of Research and Evaluation
• DeKalb Co.	No	—	—	Dr. Vivian McMillan, Assistant Supervisor Testing
• Gwinnett Co.	Yes	developing	at end of primary, elementary, middle, and senior levels	Dr. Wanda M. Warner, Director of Instruction
Hawaii	Yes	in place developing	General competencies – Gr. 10 Writing – Gr. 3, 6, 8, 10 Science, Language, Math, Reading, Social St. – Gr. 1–12 (multi-modal assessment)	Dr. Selvin Chin-Chance, Academic Testing Supervisor
Idaho	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 8, 11	Sally Tiel, Coordinator, Guidance, Assessment and Evaluation
Illinois	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 3, 6, 8, 11	Carmen Chapman, Assessment Consultant Tom Kerins, Manager, Illinois State Board of Education
• Chicago	Yes	in place		Dr. Carole Perlman, Director Student Testing
Indiana	Yes	developing	Math Language Arts	Donna Long, Mathematics Consultant Sheila Ewing, English/Language Arts Consultant
Iowa	No	—	—	Dr. Mark Haack, Chief, Bureau of Instruction and Curriculum
Kansas	Yes	in place developing researching	Math – Gr. 3, 4, 7, 10 Writing – Gr. 3, 7, 10 Reading – Gr. 3, 7, 10	—

State	Conducting a Performance Assessment Program?	Status of Program	Subject areas, grades assessed	Contact Person
Kentucky	Yes	in place	Portfolios – Gr. 4, 8, 12 Reading – Gr. 4, 8, 12 Math – Gr. 4, 8, 12 Social St. – Gr. 4, 8, 12 Science – Gr. 4, 8, 12	Cheryl Z. Tibbals, Director, Division of KIRIS C. Scott Trimble, Director, Division of Accountability
• Jefferson Co.	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 4, 8, 12	Robert J. Rodosky, Director of Research
Louisiana	Yes	in place	Writing	Rebecca S. Christian, Bureau Director
• New Orleans	No	—	—	Holly Flood, Technical Resource Assistant
• Jefferson Parish	Yes	in place		Marie Sarrat, LEAP Remediation Coordinator
Maine	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 4, 8, 11	Timothy Crockett, Coordinator, Maine Educational Assessment
Maryland	Yes	in place	Reading – Gr. 3, 5, 8 Writing – Gr. 3, 5, 8 Language usage – Gr. 3, 5, 8 Social St. – Gr. 3, 5, 8 Science – Gr. 3, 8 Math – Gr. 3, 5, 8	Robert Gabrys, Assistant State Superintendent for School Performance Hannah Kruglanski, Test Development Specialist
• Montgomery Co.	Yes	developing	—	J. Frankel, Director, DEA
Massachusetts	Yes	in place	Math – Gr. 4, 8, 12 Reading – Gr. 4, 8, 12 Science – Gr. 4, 8, 12 Social St. – Gr. 4, 8, 12	Elizabeth Badger, Assessment Director
Michigan	No	may develop in the future	—	Catherine Smith, Employability Skills Coordinator
• Detroit	Yes	in place developing	Writing other areas	Barbara Coulter, Director, Communication Arts

State	Conducting a Performance Assessment Program?	Status of Program	Subject areas, grades assessed	Contact Person
Minnesota	Yes	in place		William B. McMillan, Manager, Assessment and Evaluation
Mississippi	No	will begin a program in '94	—	Dr. Cynthia Ward, Director, Division of Testing
Missouri	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 8	James Friedebach, Director, Assessment
Montana	No	—	—	Dori Nielson, Sr. Education Analyst
Nebraska	No	planning to begin a program in '96	—	Sharon Meyer, Administrator Dr. Doug Christensen, Associate Commissioner
Nevada	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 6, 9, 11/12	Nikki Elliot, Consultant
• Clark Co.	Yes	developing	—	Judy Costa, Director, Testing and Evaluation
New Hampshire	Yes	developing	Grade 3	Paul A. Fillion, Director, Division of Instructional Services
New Jersey	Yes	developing for '93	Writing Foreign Language Math Science Social St.	Dr. Diane S. Bloom, Project Director, Statewide Writing Assessment
New Mexico	Yes	in place		Patricia Rael, Assessment and Testing Consultant
• Albuquerque	Yes	developing planning for '93-94	Math – Gr. 1, 2, 3 Reading/Writing	Kathryn Weil, Testing/Assessment Coordinator

State	Conducting a Performance Assessment Program?	Status of Program	Subject areas, grades assessed	Contact Person
New York	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 5, 8/9, 11 Math – Gr. 9 Reading – Gr. 3, 6, 8/9, 11 Physical Ed. – Gr. 4–12 Science – Gr. 4 Social St. – Gr. 6, 8, 10, 11 Foreign Language - Gr. 8	Carolyn Byrne, Director, Division of Educational Testing
• Brooklyn	No	—	—	Winifred M. Radigan, Executive Assistant for Instruction
North Carolina	Yes	in place	Writing	—
• Wake Co.	No	planning to begin a program in '93-94	—	Karen Banks, Assistant Superintendent
• Charlotte–Mecklenburg	Yes	developing	—	Susan Henry, Director of Assessment
North Dakota	No	—	—	Joan Grady, Director of Curriculum C. A. Bina, Director of Special Projects
Ohio	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 12	Roger Trent, Director Educational Service Jan Crandell, Assistant Director, Assessment Center
• Cleveland	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 1–12	Ofelia Halasa, Chief of Research and Analysis
Oklahoma	Yes	in place	Writing	Zoe Leimgrubler, Director, Student Testing
Oregon	Yes	in place developing	Writing – Gr. 3, 5, 8, 11 Math – Gr. 3, 5, 8, 11 Physical Ed. – Gr. 3, 5, 8, 11 Science – Gr. 3, 5, 8, 11	Mike Dalton, Supervisor, Student Testing

State	Conducting a Performance Assessment Program?	Status of Program	Subject areas, grades assessed	Contact Person
Pennsylvania	Yes	in place	Reading – Gr. 5, 8, 11 Math – Gr. 5, 8, 11 Writing – Gr. 6, 9	James Hertzog, Chief, Division of Evaluation and Reports
• Philadelphia	Yes	in place		Karen Scholnick, Administrative Assistant
Rhode Island	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 3 English, Foreign language, Math, Science, Social St., Art, and various vocational areas – Gr. 12	James Karon, Coordinator, State Assessment Program
South Carolina	Yes	developing	Math, Science, Language Arts – Gr. 1–12	Kathy Snyder, Authentic Assessment
• Greenville Co.	No	plan to develop a program with the state	—	Patricia Burns, Assistant to the Superintendent of Planning/Research
South Dakota	No	indefinite plans for the future	—	Gary Skoglund, Director of Testing and Guidance Karen L. Schaack, Deputy Secretary
Tennessee	Yes	developing for '92	—	Kip Reel, Administrative Assistant
• Nashville	No	—	—	Dr. Ed Brinkley, Director of Research and Evaluation
Texas	Yes	in place developing	Writing – Gr. 3, 5, 7, 9, 11/12 Science Social St. Physical Ed. and Health – Gr. 4, 8 Computer – Gr. 4, 8 Oral Language	Jenny Kile, Consultant Victoria Young, Educational Program Director
• Austin	No	—	—	LaVonne Rogers
• Ft. Worth	Yes	in place		Dr. Gary Standridge, Director, Research and Development
• San Antonio	No	—	—	Sharon Walling, Ed.D., Testing Director

State	Conducting a Performance Assessment Program?	Status of Program	Subject areas, grades assessed	Contact Person
Texas • El Paso	 Yes	developing for '92-93 or '93-94	—	Jeanne Saunders, Executive Director, Research and Evaluation
Virginia	Yes	in place	Writing (Literacy Testing Program)	Dr. Gerald M. Eads II, Division Chief, Assessment
• Fairfax Co.	Yes	in place		Dr. Marie Canny, Director, Testing and Evaluation
Vermont	Yes	in place	Writing – Gr. 4, 8 Math – Gr. 4, 8	Elizabeth Rand, Program Assistant
Washington	No	—	—	Gordon Ensign, Supervisor, State Assessment
West Virginia	No	—	—	Karen Nicholson, Coordinator
Wisconsin	Yes	developing for '92 developing for '96-'97	Writing full implementation	Darwin Kaufman, Chief, Section for Testing Program Development Tom Stefonek, Director of Bureau for Student Assessment
• Milwaukee	Yes	in place	Writing	Art Flater, Research Specialist
Wyoming	No	—	—	Jim Lendino, Director of Assessment